

Hanh Nguyen, Plaintiff *pro se*
2131 E. Camero Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89123
702-752-8382

✓
2012 SEP 11 11:59
2012 SEP 11 P 12:59

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

HANH NGUYEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

WASHINGTON MUTUAL, BANK N.A.,
et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:11-cv-01799-LRH-RJJ

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO EXTEND
TIME FOR REPLY - FRCP 6(b)

I received my service copy of "DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE."¹ The same docket # informs me "Replies due by 9/1/2012." Because "9/1/2012" was Saturday, a day this court is closed, and on the Labor Day weekend, I intended to file my Reply Tuesday, September 4th. I had prepared my Reply and a Request for Judicial Notice and asked a friend to file them with the court since she was going downtown anyway. I just now discovered my friend mistakenly filed only my Request for Judicial Notice.²

FRCP 6(b)(1)(B) expressly allows motions for late filings for excusable neglect. I do not make this Motion for any improper purpose whatsoever. This extension is needed only so the court will accept this late filing. I do not see how any prejudice to Defendants or their attorneys could result from this Motion being allowed.

¹ See Docket #21

² Docket #22

RELIEF REQUESTED

This court's order or other allowance according to FRCP 6(b)(1)(B) to allow and accept this late filing and service of my Reply. I do not wish for oral argument on this matter.

I expressly reserve the right to amend or supplement this Motion if I believe it is needed. I also reserve my right to have the court construe this paper according to FRCP 1 and 8(e) and all other applicable law.

Submitted with all rights reserved on September 11, 2012



Hanh Nguyen, Plaintiff pro se

I mailed a true copy to Defendants' attorneys

IT IS SO ORDERED.



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
DATED: September 13, 2012